



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/682,504

10/08/2003

John Strisower

027742-000110US

9866

20350 7590 12/23/2009
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

CHUMPITAZ, BOB R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/23/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/682,504	Applicant(s) STRISOWER, JOHN	
	Examiner BOB CHUMPITAZ	Art Unit 3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,9,10,15,18,22 and 32-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-21, 23-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,9,10,15,18,22 and 32-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a Final Office Action in response to communication received September 17, 2009. Claims 5, 10, 15, 18, 32-34, 37-39 have been amended and claims 6-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-21 and 23-31 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-5, 9-10, 15, 18, 22 and 32-45 are pending and are addressed below.

Response to Amendments

In light of the amendments to claim 10, the Examiner withdraws the previous objection to claim 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 35 and 40-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al. (US 5,737,491, hereinafter Allen) in view of Ausems et al. (US 6,434,403 B1, hereinafter Ausems).

As per claim 1, Allen discloses the process of making images or other data from an image capturing device or other data capturing device or a combination thereof available to one or more authorized user, said capturing device having an electronically readable device serial number and cellular Internet communication capability, said capturing device (a) providing use information

Art Unit: 3629

specifying said one or more authorized user of said images or other data, (b) capturing said images or other data, and (c) accessing the Internet with said cellular Internet communication capability for initiating the transmitting of said images or other data to a service provider associated with said device serial number, the process comprising:

said service provider associating said device serial number and said use information to provide said images or other data to said one or more authorized user (col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 7 the image transmitted via a wireless connection such as a cellular phone service; see also col. 2 lines 34-45 digital camera; see also col. 3, lines 5- 28 the transceiver is a wireless communication system such as a cellular telephone...the microprocessor is programmed to attach a unique identification code e.g. a camera serial number to each digital image produced by the camera; see also Claim 1 and col. 4, lines 36-54, digital camera includes a transmitter for transmitting the digital image file to the image fulfillment server).

Allen does not expressly disclose “use information specifying said one or more authorized user of said images or other data.”

However, Allen discloses an image fulfillment server that stores a data file relating the identification code of a digital camera with information relating to the owner of the digital camera, such as the owners phone number, credit card number, name, address or email address. Allen also discloses wherein the central processing unit is programmed to

Art Unit: 3629

read identification code associated with the digital images that are received and to retrieve the owner information (col. 3, lines 11-29).

In addition, Ausems teaches a PDA telephone that includes a camera, where the camera records video images and stores them within the PDA telephone, and where the video images recorded by the camera may be transmitted from PDA telephone in *real time* (col. 5, lines 10-23). In addition, Ausems teaches biometric sensors, such as fingerprint ID devices etc., which may be coupled to PDA telephone through I/O module, and where such sensors provide security features that prevent unauthorized users from exploiting the PDA telephone (col. 8, lines 63-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system for digital image capture and transmission which includes a central processing unit programmed to read identification code associated with the digital images and with information relating to the owner as disclosed by Allen to include an authentication operation as taught by Ausems in order to provide a means of security by including an authorizing process for users who wish to access the captured data and in order to prevent unauthorized users from accessing sensitive data.

As per claim 2, Allen further discloses wherein said capturing device deletes an image or other data responsive to its being transmitted using said capability (col. 4, lines 36-54 if the command is erase the digital image stored in the camera is erased).

As per claim 3, Allen discloses the process of making images or other data from an image capturing device or other data capturing device or a combination thereof available to one or more authorized user, said capturing device having an electronically readable device serial number and cellular Internet communication capability, said capturing device (a) providing use information specifying said one or more authorized user of said images or other data, (b) capturing said images or other data and (c) accessing a cellular service provider (CSP) or a personal communications service provider (PCSP) with said cellular Internet communication capability for initiating the transmitting of said images or other data to a service provider associated with said device serial number, the process comprising:

said CSP or PCSP transmitting said prepared images or other data to an application service provider (ASP) associated with said device serial number to enable said ASP to associate said device serial number and said use information to provide to said set of authorized users said images or other data (col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 7 the image transmitted via a wireless connection such as a cellular phone service; see also, col. 3, lines 5- 28 the transceiver is a wireless communication system such as a cellular telephone...the microprocessor is programmed to attach a unique identification code e.g. a camera serial number to each digital image produced by the camera...the central processing unit is programmed to read identification code associated with the digital images that are received and to retrieve the owner information; see also Claim 1 and col. 4, lines 36-54, digital camera includes a transmitter for transmitting the digital image file to the image fulfillment server).

Allen does not expressly disclose “use information specifying said one or more authorized user of said images or other data”

However, Allen discloses an image fulfillment server that stores a data file relating the identification code of a digital camera with information relating to the owner of the digital camera, such as the owners phone number, credit card number, name, address or email address. Allen also discloses wherein the central processing unit is programmed to read identification code associated with the digital images that are received and to retrieve the owner information (col. 3, lines 11-29).

In addition, Ausems teaches a PDA telephone that includes a camera, where the camera records video images and stores them within the PDA telephone, and where the video images recorded by the camera may be transmitted from PDA telephone in *real time* (col. 5, lines 10-23). In addition, Ausems teaches biometric sensors, such as fingerprint ID devices etc., which may be coupled to PDA telephone through I/O module, and where such sensors provide security features that prevent unauthorized users from exploiting the PDA telephone (col. 8, lines 63-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system for digital image capture and transmission which includes a central processing unit programmed to read identification code associated with the digital images

Art Unit: 3629

and with information relating to the owner as disclosed by Allen to include an authentication operation as taught by Ausems in order to provide a means of security by including an authorizing process for users who which to access the captured data and in order to prevent unauthorized users from accessing sensitive data.

As per claim 4, Allen further discloses wherein said capturing device deletes an image or other data responsive to its being transmitted using said capability (col. 4, lines 36-54 if the command is erase the digital image stored in the camera is erased).

As per claim 35, Allen further discloses wherein said images or other data are displayed in a parcel delivery application wherein parcel delivery persons capture parcel delivery images or other data by said devices for display for one or more authorized user, a newspaper reporter application in which reporters use said devices for capturing images or other data and writing news stories for interactive use by an editorial staff, *or* public safety applications in which public safety officers use said devices to capture images or other data for display for public safety situations, *or* meter reading applications in which meter readers use said devices for capturing images or data for displaying meter readings (col. 1, lines 14-30 the field of professional photography especially in the field of photo journalism and sports photography, speedy delivery of photographs of an event to the photo editor; see also, col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 7 amateur photographer can capture electronic image at a event or scenic spot).

Art Unit: 3629

As per claim 40, recites equivalent limitations to claim 1 and are, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 41, Allen further discloses wherein said capturing device deletes an image responsive to its communication over the Internet (col. 3, lines 30-49 internet communication channel; see also, col. 4, lines 36-54 function to erase the captured image).

As per claim 42, recites equivalent limitations to independent claim 1 and 40, and are, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 43, Allen further discloses wherein said capturing device deletes an image or other data responsive to its being provided to said CSP or PCSP (col. 3, lines 30-49 internet communication channel; see also, col. 4, lines 36-54 function to erase the captured image).

As per claim 44, recites equivalent limitations to independent claim 1 and 40, and are, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 45, Allen further discloses wherein said capturing device deletes an image responsive to its communication to said CSP or PCSP (col. 3, lines 30-49 internet communication channel; see also, col. 4, lines 36-54 function to erase the captured image).

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Ausems in further view of WirelessWeek (Copyright © 2002 EBSCO Publishing 7/22/02).

As per claim 36, Allen/Ausems discloses claim 1 as rejected above but do not expressly disclose wherein said ASP bills the organization whose employees use said devices, said billing being on a per unit of time used basis, a per amount of data transferred basis, a per bandwidth used basis, a flat monthly device fee basis, or a combination of the foregoing.

However, Wireless-Week Magazine teaches mMode pix (picture) pricing that charges customers \$2.99 per month plus 2 cents per kilobyte of data (see WirelessWeek article). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the central processing unit for billing purposes of Allen and sale transactions of Ausems to include a picture pricing process as taught by WirelessWeek in order to appropriately charge individuals for the proper services provided. Furthermore, it is well know and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to charge a fee for providing a service in order for business service providers to gain revenue for providing a specific business service.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roustaei et al. (US 2001/0034222 A1, hereinafter Roustaei) in view of Allen.

As per claim 5, Roustaei discloses an image capturing device or other data capturing device, or combination thereof, having cellular Internet capability ([0015-16, 37 the transceiver may be a

Art Unit: 3629

cellular phone, a personal digital assistant device or an internet appliance for transmitting data over a wireless network...apparatus comprises a buffer to store data]) and

Roustaei does not expressly disclose an apparatus operable to delete a captured image or other data as a result of said captured image or other data being completely transmitted by said capability.

However, Allen teaches an operation via a microphone that digitizes the voice command wherein if the command is erase the digital image stored is erased (col. 4, lines 36-54 if the command is erase the digital image stored in the camera is erased). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the data transmitting mechanism of Roustaei to include an erase command as taught by Allen in order to delete the captured images after it has been transmitted via a network in which will allow users to capture images for various applications and correctly transmit them over the network.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roustaei in view of Allen and in further view of Inoue et al. (US 6,853,403 B1, hereinafter Inoue).

As per claim 9, The Roustaei/Allen combination discloses claim 5 as rejected above but do not expressly disclose wherein said image or other data, or combination thereof, is captured without the use of a human at the site and time of said capture.

However, Inoue teaches a self-timer mode that allows the camera to shoot an image without the use of a human at the site and time of said capture since the capturing device

Art Unit: 3629

is set to automatically shoot an image (col. 1, lines 30-62 film cameras or digital cameras are frequently provided with a function to perform shooting by use of a self-timer; see also, col. 3, lines 3-11 the self-timer shooting mode is performed after a time from the instruction of shooting to shooting in the normal shooting mode has elapsed; see also, col. 7, lines 47-53 self timer shooting switch). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the image capturing device of the Roustaei/Allen combination to include a self timer mode as taught by Inoue in order to allow a set a self timer mechanism in which the shooting is performed automatically after the set time has elapsed which will also provide excellent camera usability.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roustaei in view of Allen and in further view of Minne et al. (US 6,950,129 B1, hereinafter Minne).

As per claim 10, The Roustaei/Allen combination discloses claim 5 as rejected above but do not expressly disclose wherein said device is a disposable camera.

However, Minne teaches a disposable digital camera that includes an electronic digital camera system for generating digital images data representative of a captured image (col. 2, lines 34-60 digital camera is a one time use or disposable digital camera for storing an image in a digital format; see also, col. 6, lines 24-30 electronic digital camera system). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the image capturing device the Roustaei/Allen combination to include a disposable digital camera as taught by Minne in order for a relatively

inexpensive disposable camera which includes the benefits of digital cameras such as storing a captured image in a digital format, including the ability to store both still and video images, with sound, in a digital format.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roustaei in view of Ausems.

As per claim 15, Roustaei discloses:

A PDA having cellular Internet access capability for receiving images or other data from a device also having cellular Internet access capability, said images or other data having been captured by said device, said PDA using its cellular Internet access capability for transmitting said images or other data over the Internet for delivery to one or more authorized user, said PDA running software providing instructions for operating on said images or other data during such delivery ([0009, 15-16, 37] the transceiver may be a cellular phone, a personal digital assistant device or an internet appliance for transmitting data over a wireless network...apparatus comprises a buffer to store data; see also, [0041-42] video mail service; processor may use compression software such as JPEG for still images and MPEG for motion images to compress the image for transmission).

Roustaei does not expressly disclose:

wherein said images or other data relate to parcel delivery applications, to public safety applications, to public utility applications, or to a combination of the foregoing, and wherein said image or other data, or combination thereof, is captured and transmitted to

Art Unit: 3629

said one or more authorized user independent of a human-initiated command to capture and transmit said image or other data.

However, Ausems teaches a PDA telephone that includes a camera, where the camera records video images and stores them within the PDA telephone, and where the video images recorded by the camera may be transmitted from PDA telephone in *real time* (col. 5, lines 10-23). In addition, Ausems teaches wherein the PDA telephone may be configured to carry out automatic checkbook functions, and where the PDA telephone may automatically update a user's checkbook each time a transaction is executed (col. 6, lines 45-59). Furthermore, Ausems teaches wherein the wireless telephone engine may retrieve an electronic mail address and/or a world wide web URL from address book in order to initiate a transaction (col. 7, lines 9-20). Lastly, Ausems teaches biometric sensors, such as fingerprint ID devices etc., which may be coupled to PDA telephone through I/O module, and where such sensors provide security features that prevent unauthorized users from exploiting the PDA telephone (col. 8, lines 63-67). (Examiner notes: Ausems teaches wherein "video images recorded by the camera may be transmitted from PDA telephone in *real time*", and "automatic data transmission functions". The Examiner considers Ausems teachings to represent the "image or other data is automatically captured and transmitted" claimed limitation. In addition, the Examiner points out that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ausems "real time" data storing and transmission capabilities to represent "automatic" functions, since it has been held that

broadly providing a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity which has accomplished the same result involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the PDA device of Roustaei to include real time data transmission, mail transactions and authentication operations as taught by Ausems in order to provide users with a time efficient process for capturing and distributing data.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ausems in view of Allen.

As per claim 18, Ausems discloses a PDA having cellular Internet access capability for receiving images or other data from a device also having cellular Internet access capability, said images or other data having been captured by said device, said PDA using its cellular Internet access capability for transmitting said images or other data to a CSP or a PCSP, said PDA running software providing said CSP or PCSP with instructions for operating on said images or other data (col. 1, lines 25-67 wireless phones are being combined with PDA's in order to perform...transmitting, receiving, and displaying text messages....a wireless telephone engine, smart-card engine and personal digital assistant engine are integrated in a single device; see also, col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 7 modem 220 is coupled to wireless phone engine 210 and enables PDA telephone 100 to send and receive fax messages, or have internet access).

Ausems does not expressly disclose:

Art Unit: 3629

wherein said image or other data, or combination thereof, relate to parcel delivery applications, to public safety applications, to public utility applications, or to a combination of the foregoing and is captured and transmitted to said CSP or PCSP independent of a human-initiated command at the site and time of said capture, and wherein said instructions are provided to said CSP or PCSP over cellular Internet access or by satellite access.

However, Ausems discloses wherein PDA's are capable of running a variety of application software packages (e.g., calculators, text and/or image editors, etc.) (col. 1, lines 21-24; see also, col. 3, lines 5-22: conventional PDA applications, security features). Ausems also teaches security features (col. 3, lines 5-21).

In addition, Allen teaches speedy delivery of photographs of an event to the photo editor performed in the field of professional photography especially in the field of photo journalism and sports photography, (col. 1, lines 14-30); and where a photographer can capture electronic image at a event or scenic spot (col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 7). In addition Allen teaches a transmission module connected to the image fulfillment server for transmitting the digital images over any one or more of a plurality of secondary communication channels (col. 3, line 29 – col.4, line 14). Furthermore, Allen teaches an input device used to enter information such as electronic addresses of file names that are to be associated with photographer's utterances in order to transmit data locally or via wireless transmissions (col. 2, line 63- col. 3, line 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the PDA applications of Ausems to include data delivery operations along with security features as taught by Allen in order to provide a method where users can easily transfer or share data in a communications system.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ausems in view of Allen and in further view of Minne.

As per claim 22, Ausems/Allen discloses claim 18 as rejected above but do not expressly disclose wherein said device is a disposable camera.

However, Minne teaches a disposable digital camera that includes an electronic digital camera system for generating digital images data representative of a captured image (col. 2, lines 34-60 digital camera is a one time use or disposable digital camera for storing an image in a digital format; see also, col. 6, lines 24-30 electronic digital camera system). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the image capturing device of Ausems and camera of Allen to include a disposable digital camera as taught by Minne in order for a relatively inexpensive disposable camera which includes the benefits of digital cameras such as storing a captured image in a digital format, including the ability to store both still and video images, with sound, in a digital format.

Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roustaei in view of Ausems and in further view of Croy et al. (US 6,476,825, hereinafter Croy).

As per claim 32, Roustaei discloses:

the process of aggregating at a service provider into one information feed multiple data streams of images or data, or a combination thereof, received via cellular Internet transmission from a plurality of devices each having an electronically readable device serial number and cellular Internet communication capability for initiating delivery of said images or other data to the service provider (Abstract: an imager for capturing and processing images for a variety of applications connected to a transceiver such as a cell phone, a PDA or an internet appliance for transmitting the images over a network; see also [0007] one or more receiving units to which the digital image is to be sent; see also [0003-4, 9, 19, 37, 42] cellular phone or portable wireless communication device...data collection terminals...method of processing images for transmission), said one information feed being displayed from a website of the service provider for at least authorized user by said service provider ([0003-4, 38, 42] viewer allows user to view images...display window for viewing the captured image).

Roustaei does not expressly disclose “aggregating into one information feed multiple data streams of images or data” where the “information feed [is] displayed for at least one authorized user”, and “received via cellular Internet transmission from a plurality of devices”.

However, Ausems teaches a PDA telephone, with internet access that includes a camera, where the camera records video images and stores them within the PDA telephone, and where the video images recorded by the camera may be transmitted from PDA telephone in *real time* (col. 5, lines 10-23). In addition, Ausems teaches biometric sensors, such as fingerprint ID devices etc., which may be coupled to PDA telephone through I/O module, and where such sensors provide security features that prevent unauthorized users from exploiting the PDA telephone (col. 8, lines 63-67).

Furthermore, Croy teaches wherein a multiplexer and an overlay unit with assistance from the image memory and mode controller, transfers data packets from the image memory for display in the hand-held remote device (col. 26, lines 1-42). In addition Croy teaches wherein at least one server must be installed to supply the remote device with information transmitted over the internet (col. 10, lines 35-40; see also col. 24, line 54 – col. 25, line 14: security of e-commerce transaction...user identity and authorization; see also Claim 22: overlay unit for combining said video content with microcontroller generated images).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the PDA or an internet appliance for transmitting the images over a network of Roustaei to include an authentication operation as taught by Ausems and the multiplexed data streams as taught by Croy in order to display aggregated data streams

Art Unit: 3629

received via communication means (internet/cellular) from plurality of devices to authorized users in order to prevent access to sensitive transmitted data.

As per claim 33, Roustaei discloses the process of a CSP or PCSP aggregating for an ASP into one information feed multiple data streams of images or data, or a combination thereof received via cellular Internet transmission from a plurality of devices each having an electronically readable device serial number and cellular Internet communication capability for initiating delivery of said images or other data to an ASP (Abstract: an imager for capturing and processing images for a variety of applications connected to a transceiver such as a cell phone, a PDA or an internet appliance for transmitting the images over a network; see also [0007] one or more receiving units to which the digital image is to be sent; see also [0004, 9, 19, 42] cellular phone or portable wireless communication device...data collection terminals...method of processing images for transmission), said one information feed being displayed from a website of the ASP for an authorized user by said ASP ([0003-4, 38, 42] viewer allows user to view images...display window for viewing the captured image).

Roustaei does not expressly disclose “aggregating into one information feed multiple data streams of images or data” where the “information feed [is] displayed for at least one authorized user”, and “received via cellular Internet transmission from a plurality of devices”.

However, Ausems teaches a PDA telephone, with internet access that includes a camera, where the camera records video images and stores them within the PDA telephone, and

Art Unit: 3629

where the video images recorded by the camera may be transmitted from PDA telephone in *real time* (col. 5, lines 10-23). In addition, Ausems teaches biometric sensors, such as fingerprint ID devices etc., which may be coupled to PDA telephone through I/O module, and where such sensors provide security features that prevent unauthorized users from exploiting the PDA telephone (col. 8, lines 63-67).

Furthermore, Croy teaches wherein a multiplexer and an overlay unit with assistance from the image memory and mode controller, transfers data packets from the image memory for display in the hand-held remote device (col. 26, lines 1-42). In addition Croy teaches wherein at least one server must be installed to supply the remote device with information transmitted over the internet (col. 10, lines 35-40; see also col. 24, line 54 – col. 25, line 14: security of e-commerce transaction...user identity and authorization; see also Claim 22: overlay unit for combining said video content with microcontroller generated images).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the PDA or an internet appliance for transmitting the images over a network of Roustaei to include an authentication operation as taught by Ausems and the multiplexed data streams as taught by Croy in order to display aggregated data streams received via communication means (internet/cellular) from plurality of devices to authorized users in order to prevent access to sensitive transmitted data.

Art Unit: 3629

As per claim 34, Roustaei discloses the process of an ASP aggregating into one information feed multiple data streams of images or data, or a combination thereof received via cellular Internet transmission from a plurality of devices each having an electronically readable device serial number and cellular Internet communication capability for initiating delivery of said images or other data to the ASP (Abstract: an imager for capturing and processing images for a variety of applications connected to a transceiver such as a cell phone, a PDA or an internet appliance for transmitting the images over a network; see also [0007] one or more receiving units to which the digital image is to be sent; see also [0004, 9, 19, 42] cellular phone or portable wireless communication device...data collection terminals...method of processing images for transmission]), said one information feed being displayed from a website of the ASP for one or more authorized user by said ASP ([0003-4, 38, 42] viewer allows user to view images...display window for viewing the captured image).

Roustaei does not expressly disclose “aggregating into one information feed multiple data streams of images or data” where the “information feed [is] displayed for at least one authorized user”, and “received via cellular Internet transmission from a plurality of devices”.

However, Ausems teaches a PDA telephone, with internet access that includes a camera, where the camera records video images and stores them within the PDA telephone, and where the video images recorded by the camera may be transmitted from PDA telephone in *real time* (col. 5, lines 10-23). In addition, Ausems teaches biometric sensors, such as fingerprint ID devices etc., which may be coupled to PDA telephone through I/O module,

and where such sensors provide security features that prevent unauthorized users from exploiting the PDA telephone (col. 8, lines 63-67).

Furthermore, Croy teaches wherein a multiplexer and an overlay unit with assistance from the image memory and mode controller, transfers data packets from the image memory for display in the hand-held remote device (col. 26, lines 1-42). In addition Croy teaches wherein at least one server must be installed to supply the remote device with information transmitted over the internet (col. 10, lines 35-40; see also col. 24, line 54 – col. 25, line 14: security of e-commerce transaction...user identity and authorization; see also Claim 22: overlay unit for combining said video content with microcontroller generated images).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the PDA or an internet appliance for transmitting the images over a network of Roustaei to include an authentication operation as taught by Ausems and the multiplexed data streams as taught by Croy in order to display aggregated data streams received via communication means (internet/cellular) from plurality of devices to authorized users in order to prevent access to sensitive transmitted data.

Claims 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roustaei in view of Allen in view of Croy and in further view of Shaginaw et al. (US 2003/010594 A1, hereinafter Shaginaw).

Art Unit: 3629

As per claims 37, Roustaei discloses the process of aggregating at a service provider into one information feed multiple data streams of fragmentary data received via cellular Internet transmission from a plurality of devices each having an electronically readable device serial number and cellular Internet communication capability for initiating delivery of said images or other data to the service provider, said one information feed being displayed using an XML or other agreed protocol data feed for displaying said images or other data to one or more authorized user by said service provider ([0004, 9, 19, 38, 42] cellular phone or portable wireless communication device...data collection terminals...method of processing images for transmission.....viewer allows user to view images...display window for viewing the captured image).

Roustaei does not expressly disclose “aggregating into one information feed multiple data streams of fragmentary data” and “said one information feed being displayed using an XML or other agreed protocol data feed.”

However, Roustaei discloses different image capturing devices such as scanners and data collection terminals available to the user [0009]. A scanner can capture encoded information from a two dimensional bar code stored in today's known optical encoding methods such as Data Matrix, Codabar or PDF417, as a result, the scanner reads the encoded bar code data [0013]. Furthermore, Roustaei discloses taking a sequential series of images and wherein each image is then reduced to lower pixel format, and where format reduction may be achieved using windowing, binning or sub-sampling techniques

[0020]. Roustaei further discloses using windowing techniques the processor can read out data from only a portion of the sensor array [0045].

In addition, Allen teaches wherein an image is transmitted via a wireless connection such as a cellular phone service (col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 7; see also col. 2 lines 34-45: digital camera); and wherein the transceiver is a wireless communication system such as a cellular telephone, and a microprocessor is programmed to attach a unique identification code e.g. a camera serial number to each digital image produced by the camera and where the central processing unit is programmed to read identification code associated with the digital images that are received and to retrieve the owner information (col. 3, lines 5- 28); and wherein the digital camera includes a transmitter for transmitting the digital image file to the image fulfillment server (Claim 1 and col. 4, lines 36-54). In addition, Allen teaches an image fulfillment server that stores a data file relating the identification code of a digital camera with information relating to the owner of the digital camera, such as the owners phone number, credit card number, name, address or email address (col. 3, lines 11-29).

Furthermore, Croy teaches wherein a multiplexer and an overlay unit with assistance from the image memory and mode controller, transfers data packets from the image memory for display in the hand-held remote device (col. 26, lines 1-42). In addition Croy teaches wherein at least one server must be installed to supply the remote device with information transmitted over the internet (col. 10, lines 35-40; see also col. 24, line 54 –

Art Unit: 3629

col. 25, line 14: security of e-commerce transaction...user identity and authorization; see also Claim 22: overlay unit for combining said video content with microcontroller generated images).

Lastly, Shaginaw teaches sending files in XML format in which allow designers to create custom tags and enables the definition, transmission, validation and interpretation of data between application and organization [0045].

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the PDA or an internet appliance for transmitting the images over a network of Roustaei to include identification code as taught by Allen and the multiplexed data streams as taught by Croy and providing data files in XML format as taught by Shaginaw in order to display aggregated data streams received via communication means (internet/cellular) from plurality of devices and displaying data in XML format to the authorized users in order to improve user access and prevent access to sensitive transmitted data.

As per claims 38 and 39, recite equivalent limitations to claim 37 and are, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

Please note:

Art Unit: 3629

Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *e.g. In re Collier*, 158 USPQ 266, 267 (CCPA 1968)(where the court interpreted the claimed phrase “a connector member for engaging shield means” and held that the shield means was not a positive element of the claim since “[t]here is no positive inclusion of ‘shield means’ in what is apparently intended to be a claim to structure consisting of a combination of elements.”

Applicant(s) are reminded that optional or conditional elements do not narrow the claims because they can always be omitted. See *e.g.* MPEP §2106 II C: “Language that suggest or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. [Emphasis in original.]”; and *In re Johnston*, 435 F.3d 1381, 77 USPQ2d 1788, 1790 (Fed. Cir. 2006) “As a matter of linguistic

Art Unit: 3629

precision, optional elements do not narrow the claim because they can always be omitted.” *In re Johnston*, 435 F.3d 1381, 77 USPQ2d 1788, 1790 (Fed. Cir. 2006)(where the Federal Circuit affirmed the Board’s claim construction of “further including that said wall may be smooth, corrugated, or profiled with increased dimensional proportions as pipe size is increased” since “this additional content did not narrow the scope of the claim because these limitations are stated in the permissive form ‘may.’”).

Functional recitation(s) using the word “for” have been considered but given less patentable weight^[1] because they fail to add any steps and are thereby regarded as intended use language. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in additional steps. See *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Laboratories, Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1368, 1375-76, 58 USPQ2d 1508, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (Where the language in a method claim states only a purpose and intended result, the expression does not result in a manipulative difference in the steps of the claim.).

^[1] See e.g. *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983)(stating that although all limitations must be considered, not all limitations are entitled to patentable weight.).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments submitted on September 4, 2009 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues the following:

As per claim 1:

(1) Applicant respectfully submits that Ausems does not make up for Allen's failure to disclose, teach, or suggest "use information specifying said one or more authorized user of said images or other data" as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Allen in view of Ausems.

As per claim 3:

(2) Claim 3 recites a process that includes "said capturing device (a) providing use information specifying said one or more authorized user of said images or other data." Therefore, for at least reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Allen and Ausems does not teach such subject matter as recited in claim 3.

As per claim 40:

(3) Claim 40 recites a process that includes "using use information specifying one or more authorized user of said images or other data." Therefore, for at least reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Allen and Ausems does not teach such subject matter as recited in claim 40.

As per Claim 42:

(4) Claim 42 recites a process that includes "use information specifying said one or more authorized users of said images or other data." Therefore, for at least reasons similar to

Art Unit: 3629

those discussed above in connection with claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Allen and Ausems does not teach such subject matter as recited in claim 42.

As per Claim 44:

(5) Claim 44 recites a process that includes "using use information specifying one or more authorized user of said images or other data." Therefore, for at least reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Allen and Ausems does not teach such subject matter as recited in claim 44.

In response to argument(s) (1)-(5), Examiner respectfully disagrees. For clarification purposes to the previously noted rejection of claim 1, the claim limitation, as currently recited: "use information specifying said one or more authorized user of said images or other data," can be broadly interpreted to mean "information relating to the owner of the digital camera, such as owners phone number, credit card number, name, address or email address" as disclosed by Allen. The Examiner included the teachings of Ausems to further clarify Allen's disclosure by pointing to the general "use information" functionalities involved in the operation of a digital capturing device. Ausems teaches biometric sensors, such as fingerprint ID devices etc. that may be coupled to a PDA telephone through I/O modules. Clearly it can be broadly interpreted that biometric sensors contain user verification or authorization mechanisms which can also be considered to be part of "use information" in order to verify a user of the digital capturing

Art Unit: 3629

device in association to images or other data. Therefore, the Examiner maintains the previous rejection to claims 1, 3, 40, 42 and 44.

As per Claim 36:

(6) Applicant respectfully submits that WirelessWeek does not make up for Allen and Ausem's failure to disclose, teach, or suggest "said capturing device (a) providing use information specifying said one or more authorized user of said images or other data," as recited in claim 1, from which claim 36 depends.

In response to argument (6), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Although claim 36 depends from claim 35 which in turn depends from independent claim 1, the claim limitations recited in Claim 36 do not explicitly recite: "said capturing device (a) providing use information specifying said one or more authorized user of said images or other data." Claim 36 is directed to different claim limitations, which the Allen/Ausem/WirelessWeek combination disclose as noted in the rejection above. Therefore, the Examiner maintains the previous rejection to claim 36.

As per Claim 5:

(7) Applicant respectfully submits that Roustaei and Allen do not in fact disclose, teach, or suggest "an apparatus to delete a captured image or other data as a result of said captured image or other data being completely transmitted by said capability," as recited in claim 5.

As per Claim 9:

(8) Applicant respectfully submits that Inoue does not make up for Roustaei and Allen's failure to disclose, teach, or suggest "an image capturing device or other data capturing device, or combination thereof, having cellular Internet capability and an apparatus operable to delete a captured image or other data as a result of said captured image or other data being completely transmitted by said capability," as recited in claim 5, from which claim 9 depends. Inoue does not, however, disclose, teach, or suggest the apparatus recited in claim 5 and, through dependency, in claim 9.

As per claim 10:

(9) Applicant respectfully submits that Minne does not make up for Roustai and Allen's failure to disclose, teach, or suggest "an image capturing device or other data capturing device, or combination thereof, having cellular Internet capability and an apparatus operable to delete a captured image or other data as a result of said captured image or other data being completely transmitted by said capability," as recited in claim 5, from which claim 10 depends. Minne, however, does not disclose, teach, or suggest the apparatus recited in claim 5 and, through dependency, in claim 10.

In response to arguments (7)-(9), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 5 is directed to an apparatus, where the apparatus is capable and provides a function to delete a captured image or other data as a result of said captured image or other data being completely transmitted by said capability. The Examiner stands by the current rejection, since the apparatus disclosed in the Roustaei/Allen combination contains the same capabilities and functions for deleting a captured image, as noted in the rejection above. To add clarity to the teachings of Allen, where Allen teaches the operations to delete/erase an image, it can be broadly interpreted to obtain the same functions recited in the claim limitations, by utilizing the delete functions taught by Allen. For example, the delete function, although processed using a voice command, performs the same functionalities as recited in the claim. The voice command triggers the delete operation that is being performed by the image capturing device. Therefore, the image capturing device (apparatus) of Allen and of the claimed invention are both capable of performing said delete operation as a result of said capture image. Clearly the delete operation would only serve its purpose once an image is captured; otherwise there would not be the need for such operation. Furthermore, with respect to "image capturing device or other data capturing device.....having cellular internet capability" Roustaei clearly discloses an apparatus equivalent to the one being claimed, that contain internet capabilities (please see at least paragraphs [0003, 9, 16, 37] of Roustaei). Therefore, as noted above, claims 5, 9 and 10 stands rejected over the same prior rejections as noted above.

As per claim 15:

Art Unit: 3629

(10) As amended, claim 15 recites that "said image or other data, or combination thereof, is captured and transmitted to said one or more authorized user independent of a human-initiated command to capture and transmit said image or other data." As best understood by Applicant, the device in Ausems requires a human-initiated command to record video images in real time.

In response to argument (10), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Roustaei/Ausems combination discloses the argued subject matter. Ausems does teach real time image transmission, and other automatic image data transmission operations as currently recited in the rejection above. The automatic data transmission operations inhibit functions which are independent of a human initiated command. Therefore, claim 15 stands rejected over the Roustaei/Allen/Minne combination.

As per claim 18:

(11) Such subject matter as recited in claim 18 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Ausems in view of Allen. For example, claim 18 recites "said image or other data, or combination thereof...is captured and transmitted to said CSP or PCSP independent of a human-initiated command at the site and time of said capture." As discussed above in connection with claim 15, Ausems (and also Roustaei, whether individually or in combination with Ausems) does not disclose, teach, or suggest this element. Applicant respectfully submits that Allen does not make up for the failure of Ausems (and/or Roustaei) to teach this element.

In response to argument (11), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Based on the similarity to argument (10), argument (11) is also not persuasive based on the same principles explained above with respect to claim 15.

As per claim 22:

(12) Applicant respectfully submits that Minne does not make up for Roustai and Allen's failure to disclose, teach, or suggest "said image or other data, or combination thereof...[being] captured and transmitted to said CSP or PCSP independent of a human-initiated command at the site and time of said capture," as recited in claim 18, from which claim 22 depends.

In response to argument (12), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Based on the similarity to argument (10)-(11), argument (12) is also not persuasive based on the same principles explained above with respect to claims 15 and 18.

As per claim 32:

(13) Such subject matter as recited in claim 32 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Roustai, Allen, Croy, and Shaginaw, either individually or in combination. Croy does not make up for the failure of Roustai to disclose, teach, or suggest "aggregating at a service provider into one information feed multiple data streams of images or data."

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Croy is not analogous art. In order to rely on a prior art reference in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103, the reference must be analogous art. MPEP 2141.01 (a). For a reference to be analogous, it must either be in

Art Unit: 3629

Applicant's field of endeavor or must be a reference that is reasonably pertinent because it deals with matter that logically would have commended itself to an inventor's attention in considering his or her invention as a whole. *Id.* Croy teaches a base station that connects to a television monitor and communicates with a hand-held remote device. As described by Croy, the base unit is used in "a control device and system for remotely viewing video programming and for monitoring and controlling electronic devices. Claim 32, however, recites "the process of aggregating at a service provider into one information feed multiple data streams of images or data." Applicant respectfully submits that these fields are substantially different and that Croy does not deal with matter that logically would have commended itself to an inventor's attention in considering his or her invention as a whole. Therefore, even assuming *arguendo* that Croy teaches "aggregating at a service provider into one information feed multiple data streams of images or data" (which it does not), the combination of Croy's teachings with the teachings of the other cited references would nevertheless be improper. Applicant respectfully submits that Allen and Shaginaw also do not make up for the failure of Roustaei and Croy to disclose, teach, or suggest "aggregating at a service provider into one information feed multiple data streams of images or data," as recited in claim 32. Applicant further submits that Roustaei, Croy, Allen, and Shaginaw do not disclose, teach, or suggest, either individually or in combination, "said one information feed being displayed from a website of the service provider for at least one authorized user by said service provider," as recited in claim 32. Applicant respectfully submits that, even assuming *arguendo* that Croy teaches aggregating into one information feed multiple data streams, as recited in

claim 32, Croy still does not teach "said one information feed being displayed from a website of the service provider for at least one authorized user by said service provider" at least because the hand-held device of Croy does not display anything "from a website of the service provider," as recited in claim 32. Applicant further submits that Roustaei, Allen, and Shaginaw do not make up for the failure of Croy to teach this element. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 32 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 5 103 over Roustai, Croy, Allen, and Shaginaw.

In response to applicant's argument that Croy is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The Roustaei/Ausems/Croy combination does disclose the claimed limitations. With respect to "aggregating at a service provider into one information feed multiple data streams of images or data," Roustaei discloses viewer 23 for viewing captured images prior to and after processing ([0004, 14]).

Furthermore, Roustaei discloses an imaging accessory that can be connected to a transceiver with the advantage that it allows the user to capture various image formats. Lastly, Roustaei discloses wherein image data captured by the image capturing device is transmitted to a web site for storage and is made available to a user ([0041]). Therefore, providing an aggregation feature that allows multiple image data, captured by multiple image capturing devices, to be fed into a website (service provider) for storing and making said image data available to various users. Additionally, Ausems teaches an image capturing device (cellular phone) with internet and image transmission capabilities, and also that provides users with a function to access the captured data, as noted in the rejection above. Croy is further added to clarify the image data transmission operations associated with the transfer of data via the internet into a hand-held remote device. Croy teaches a server, similar to the website of Roustaei for storing, transmitting and displaying captured image data to a user. Therefore, as currently recited, the noted claimed limitations can be broadly interpreted to fall under the disclosure of Roustaei in view of Ausems and in further view of Croy.

As per claim 33:

(14) For at least reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 32, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Roustaei, Allen, Shaginaw, and Croy does not teach such subject matter as recited in claim 33.

As per claim 34:

(15) For at least reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 32, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Roustaei, Allen, Shaginaw, and Croy does not teach such subject matter as recited in claim 34.

As per claim 37:

(16) For at least reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 32, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Roustaei, Allen, Shaginaw, and Croy does not teach such subject matter as recited in claim 37.

As per claim 38:

(17) For at least reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 32, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Roustaei, Allen, Shaginaw, and Croy does not teach such subject matter as recited in claim 38.

As per claim 39:

(18) For at least reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 32, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combination of Roustaei, Allen, Shaginaw, and Croy does not teach such subject matter as recited in claim 39.

In response to arguments (14)-(18), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Based on the similarity to argument (13), arguments (14)-(18) are also not persuasive based on the same principles explained above with respect to claim 32.

Dependent claims:

(19) This amendment addresses the independent claims and some dependent claims pending in the application. Because Applicant submits that the independent claims are allowable, the other dependent claims are allowable at least because they are dependent upon an allowable claim. Nevertheless, Applicant submits that the dependent claims further define subject matter not shown in or made obvious in view of the prior art.

In response to argument (19), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Based on the line of dependency to the argued independent claims noted above, arguments to the dependent claims are also not persuasive based on the same principles explained above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 3629

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BOB CHUMPITAZ whose telephone number is (571)270-5494. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TR: 7:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN WEISS can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-270-6494.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

B. C.
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/JOHN G. WEISS/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629